	Case 1:24-cv-01407-KES-HBK	Document 19	Filed 06/12/25	Page 1 of 3					
1									
1									
2									
3 4									
5									
6									
7									
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
10									
11	SHELTON BENOITE,	Ca	nse No. 1:24-cv-014	07-KES-HBK (PC)					
12	Plaintiff,			PLAINTIFF'S MOTION					
13	v.		O SUPPLEMENT T	HE COMPLAINT					
14	WARDEN J. DOERER, et al.,	,	(Doc. No. 17)						
15	Defendants.	ORDER SUA SPONTE GRANTING PLAINTIFF AN EXTENSION OF TIME T RESPOND TO SCREENING ORDER		ENSION OF TIME TO					
16		JU	ILY 14, 2025 DEAI	OLINE					
17									
18	On November 18, 2024, Plaintiff, a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a complaint								
19	filed pursuant to <i>Bivens v. Six Unknown</i>		v	· ·					
20	the Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"). (Doc. No. 1, "Complaint"). On April 1, 2025, the Court								
21	issued a Screening Order on Plaintiff's original complaint and found it failed to state a claim upon								
22	which relief may be granted. (Doc. No. 14, "Screening Order"). The Court afforded Plaintiff an								
23	opportunity to elect one of three options no later than May 15, 2025: (1) file an Amended								
24	Complaint; (2); file a notice stating that he intends to stand on the Complaint as screened subject								
25	to the undersigned recommending the district court to dismiss the Complaint for the reasons								
26	stated in this Screening Order; or (3) file a notice stating he wishes to voluntarily dismiss this								
27									
28	<sup>1</sup> 403 U.S. 388 (1971).								

## Case 1:24-cv-01407-KES-HBK Document 19 Filed 06/12/25 Page 2 of 3

action without prejudice under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41 to avoid a strike. (Id. at 9, ¶1). If Plaintiff elected to file an amended complaint, he was further appraised that it must be free-standing and complete. (Id. at 8:11-13).

On May 9, 2025, seemingly in response to the Screening Order, Plaintiff filed a motion to supplement his complaint. (Doc. No. 17, "Motion"). Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(d), a plaintiff may supplement a pleading to set forth events occurring after the original complaint was filed. "While leave to permit supplemental pleading is favored, it cannot be used to introduce a separate, distinct and new cause of action." *Planned Parenthood of S. Arizona v. Neely*, 130 F.3d 400, 402 (9th Cir. 1997) (cleaned up). Nonetheless, because the Court found Plaintiff's complaint did not state a viable claim, he cannot supplement it by motion. To the extent Plaintiff seeks to include additional facts in support of his claims identified in his Motion, he may do so in his amended complaint as the Court previously directed in the April 1, 2025 Screening Order.

Due to Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court sua sponte will grant Plaintiff another opportunity to respond to the Screening Order. If Plaintiff elects to file an amended complaint, Plaintiff is again cautioned that his amended complaint replaces his original complaint and, thus, it must be freestanding and complete on its face. *Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner & Co., Inc.*, 896 F.2d 1542, 1546 (9th Cir. 1989). It cannot reference or incorporate the prior complaint, and it must include all grounds for relief. *See* Local Rule 220. The Court urges Plaintiff to use the court's approved complaint form for preparing his amended complaint. Plaintiff must identify each person he believes is responsible for each claim and explain how each defendant was involved and what actions they took or failed to take that caused harm or violated his rights. Plaintiff should number each claim and present a short plain statement of facts in support of each claim in separate paragraphs. He should provide a short statement of facts in support of each claim.

## Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to supplement the complaint (Doc. No. 17) is DENIED.
- 2. The Court sua sponte grants Plaintiff an extension of time to file a response to the

	Case 1:24-	cv-01407-KES-HBK	Document 19	Filed 06/12/25	Page 3 of 3			
1		Court's April 1, 2025,	the Court issued a	Screening Order.	Plaintiff must deliver his			
2		response to correctiona	al officials for mail	ing <b>no later than</b>	July 14, 2025.			
3	3. If Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this Court Order or seek an extension of time							
4		comply, the Court will	recommend that the	ne district court dis	smiss this action for			
5	Plaintiff's failure to comply with this Court Order and prosecute this action.							
6	4.	4. The Clerk of Court shall include a blank civil rights complaint form for Plaintiff's us						
7		as appropriate.						
8								
9	Dated: _	June 12, 2025		X/10. 72.7	Barch-Buelte			
10		Julie 12, 2023		ELENA M. BARC	H-KUCHTA			
11			UN	NITED STATES N	MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								